

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ANDREW OSTROWSKI, individually and  
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

NVIDIA CORPORATION and  
GIGABYTE GLOBAL BUSINESS  
CORPORATION D/B/A GIGA-BYTE  
TECHNOLOGY CO. LTD.,

Defendants.

**Case No. 15-cv-00760-CRB**

CLASS ACTION

**STIPULATED ORDER CONSOLIDATING  
CASES AND SETTING INITIAL  
SCHEDULE**

**Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer**

**Complaint Filed: February 19, 2015**

PEDRO SANTIAGO,

Plaintiff,

v.

NVIDIA CORPORATION; ASUS  
COMPUTER INTERNATIONAL; and  
TIGERDIRECT, INC.,

Defendants.

**Case No. 15-cv-00789-PSG**

CLASS ACTION

MARK ROUSHION, on behalf of himself  
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

**Case No. 15-cv-01102-DMR**

CLASS ACTION

1 NVIDIA CORPORATION and EVGA  
2 CORPORATION,

3 Defendants.

4 Presently before the Court is the Joint Motion to Consolidate Related Actions and  
5 Require Filing of a Consolidated Amended Complaint (“Consolidation Motion”) submitted by  
6 Plaintiffs in the above entitled cases and joined in by Defendants NVIDIA Corporation, Asus  
7 Computer International, Gigabyte Global Business Corporation d/b/a Giga-Byte Technology Co.  
8 Ltd and TigerDirect, Inc.

9 The Consolidation Motion seeks consolidation of the following three putative class  
10 actions filed on February 19 and 20 and March 9, 2015, which were filed in this District and  
11 have been or are in the process of being related to this Court:

- 12 • *Ostrowski v. NVIDIA Corporation, et al.*, No. 15-cv-00760-CRB
- 13 • *Santiago v. NVIDIA Corporation, et al.*, No. 15-cv-00789-PSG
- 14 • *Roushion v. NVIDIA Corporation, et al.*, No. 15-cv-01102-DMR

15 Based on a review of the complaints in the above actions, the Court finds each of the  
16 actions listed above meets the prerequisites for pre-trial consolidation under Federal Rule of  
17 Civil Procedure 42(a). The Court finds all parties and the Court would benefit from the  
18 efficiency that would result from consolidation. The parties collectively agree the above cases  
19 should be consolidated for all purposes as part of *Ostrowski v. NVIDIA Corporation, et al.*, Case  
20 No. 25-cv-00760-CRB.

21 **IT IS THEREFORE HEREBY ORDERED:**

22 **I. CONSOLIDATION OF RELATED CASES**

23 1. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a), the actions listed above are  
24 hereby consolidated for all proceedings before this Court. The consolidated action shall be  
25 captioned:

26 *In re NVIDIA GTX 970 Graphics Chip Litigation*, Case No. 15-cv-00760-CRB.

27 ///

28 ///

II. **MASTER DOCKET AND CAPTION**

2. The docket in *Ostrowski v. NVIDIA Corporation, et al.*, Case No. 15-cv-00760-CRB shall constitute the Master Docket for this action.

3. Every pleading filed in the consolidated action shall bear the following caption:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE: NVIDIA GTX 970 GRAPHICS CHIP  
LITIGATION

This Document Relates to:

4. When the document being filed pertains to all actions, the phrase “All Actions” shall appear immediately after the phrase “This Document Relates To:”. When a pleading applies to one, but not all actions, the document shall list the docket number for each individual action to which the document applies, along with the last name of the first-listed plaintiff in said action (*e.g.*, “No. 15-cv-00760-CRB (Ostrowski)”) immediately after the phrase “This Document Relates to:”.

5. The Parties shall file a Notice of Related Case pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-12 whenever a new case that should be related or consolidated into this action is filed in, or transferred to, this District. If the parties agree that a case should be consolidated as part of these proceedings, they shall file a stipulation for an order of consolidation with the Court. If the Court determines the case is related and should be consolidated, the clerk shall:

- a. Place a copy of this Order in the separate file for such action;
- b. Serve on Plaintiff’s counsel in the new case a copy of this Order;
- c. Direct this Order be served upon Defendants in the new case; and
- d. Make the appropriate entry in the Master Docket.

If the parties do not agree that the new case should be consolidated, any party may file a motion for consolidation under Rule 42 for the Court’s consideration.

**III. SCHEDULE AND RELATED MATTERS**

6. Plaintiffs shall file a Consolidated Amended Complaint within thirty (30) days after the entry of this Order, unless otherwise agreed upon by the parties and approved by the Court. This complaint shall be the operative complaint for all further proceedings. Any motions pending that are directed at or related to any of the complaints filed in the actions subject to this Order shall be deemed withdrawn, with Defendants reserving all rights to re-file such motions or to separately agree to request this Court rule upon such motions based on the submitted briefing. Defendants are not required to respond to the complaints in any action consolidated into this action other than to the Consolidated Amended Complaint, with Defendants reserving the right to file further responsive pleadings to a particular proceeding after remand to the transferor forum for trial.

7. Defendants shall file responsive pleadings to the Consolidated Amended Complaint within thirty (30) days after service, unless otherwise agreed upon by the parties and approved by the Court. If Defendants file any motions directed at the Consolidated Amended Complaint, the opposition and reply briefs shall be filed within thirty days (30) and twenty-one (21) days, respectively, of that response, unless otherwise agreed upon by the parties or ordered by the Court.

8. All other dates set in the *Ostrowski* action shall remain on calendar absent further Order from the Court.

**IV. MODIFICATION OF THIS ORDER**

9. This Order may be modified or supplemented by the Court or on motion by any party for good cause shown.

DATED: March 24, 2015



HON. CHARLES R. BREYER  
District Judge

So Stipulated by All Parties:

WHATLEY KALLAS LLP

By: /s/ Alan M. Mansfield  
ALAN M. MANSFIELD (SBN 125998)  
amansfield@whatleykallas.com  
1 Sansome Street, 35<sup>th</sup> Fl., PMB # 131

1 San Francisco, CA 94104  
Tel: (415) 860-2503  
2 Fax: (888) 331-9633

3 WHATLEY KALLAS, LLP  
Joe R. Whatley, Jr. (*To Apply Pro Hac Vice*)  
4 1180 Avenue of the Americas, 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10036  
5 Tel: (212) 447-7060  
Fax: (800) 922-4851

6 WIGGINS CHILDS PANTAZIS FISHER GOLDFARB  
7 Dennis G. Pantazis (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
dgp@wigginschilds.com  
8 Robert J. Camp (*To Apply Pro Hac Vice*)  
rcamp@wigginschilds.com  
9 D. G. Pantazis, Jr. (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
dgpjr@wigginschilds.com  
10 The Kress Building  
301 Nineteenth Street North  
11 Birmingham, AL 35203  
Tel: (205) 314-0500  
12 Fax: (205) 314-0757

13 LOWE LAW FIRM, LLC  
E. Clayton Lowe, Jr. (*To Apply Pro Hac Vice*)  
14 clowe@lowelaw.com  
The Kress Building  
15 301 Nineteenth Street North, Suite 525  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
16 Tel: (205) 314-0607

17 Attorneys for Plaintiff Andrew Ostrowski

18 BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.

19 By: /s/L. Timothy Fisher  
L. Timothy Fisher  
20 ltfisher@bursor.com  
Julia A. Luster  
21 jluster@bursor.com  
1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940  
22 Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
Tel: (925) 300-4455  
23 Fax: (925) 407-2700

24 Scott A. Bursor (SBN 276006)  
scott@bursor.com  
25 888 Seventh Avenue  
New York, NY 10019  
26 Tel: (212) 989-9113  
Fax: (212) 989-9163

27 Attorneys for Plaintiff Pedro Santiago  
28

1 KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER, LLP

2 By: S/Laurence D. King  
3 LAURENCE D. KING (SBN 206423)

4 lking@kaplanfox.com  
Linda Fong (SBN 124232)  
lfong@kaplanfox.com  
5 Mario M. Choi (SBN 243409)  
mchoi@kaplanfox.com  
6 350 Sansome Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
7 Tel: (415) 772-4700  
Fax: (415) 772-4707

8 KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER, LLP  
9 Frederic S. Fox (*To Apply Pro Hac Vice*)  
ffox@kaplanfox.com  
10 David A. Straite (*To Apply Pro Hac Vice*)  
dstraite@kaplanfox.com  
11 850 Third Ave., 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10022  
12 Tel: (212) 687-1980  
Fax: (212) 687-7714

13 WITES & KAPETAN, P.A.  
14 Marc A. Wites (*To Apply Pro Hac Vice*)  
mwites@wklawyers.com  
15 4400 North Federal Highway  
Lighthouse Point, FL 33064  
16 Tel: (954) 570-8989  
Fax: (954) 354-0206

17 Attorneys for Plaintiff MARK ROUSHION

18 ORRICK HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFF LLP

19 By: /s/Alexander K. Talarides  
20 atalarides@orrick.com

21 Robert P. Varian  
rvarian@orrick.com  
22 James N. Kramer  
jkramer@orrick.com  
405 Howard Street  
23 San Francisco, CA 94105-2669  
Tel: (415) 773-4254  
24 Fax: (415) 773-5759

25 Attorneys for Defendants NVIDIA Corporation,  
Asus Computer International,  
26 Gigabyte Global Business Corporation  
d/b/a Giga-Byte Technology Co. Ltd,  
27 and TigerDirect, Inc.